

ph(JMS)

7/19/71

Further ref mailing 7/13:

If I forget, I'm filing the 3 pp of the 5/10 Stern memo under Os as Agt. and have filed the first page of the FBI statement on declassification under 1970 Review, my files.

Your memo to files on anon. threat: agreed on typewriter, which he did not use until after WC, judging from his corres. - have: I have several samples. It agreed on wisdom using different ones, one uses what is available. I am by no means fixed on this suspect and suggest that since he is obvious, solid checking can exculpate as well as incriminate. Of the machines he used, there is one that is consistent, one page that I have seen of many, and I know that may be true of perhaps 5,000,000 machines. The H.O. possibilities: one never used any typewriter, the other has used but one, entirely inconsistent-even different size, and that not available during this period.

Your 7/13 to Lesar: whether you are a pauper does not, in the long pull on a lawsuit, mean are you liquid or have you income. It cost more than \$1,000 to print the appeal in the spectro case, and that is but a single cost. Jim may advise you otherwise, but I strongly encourage you to file pro se, which you can do even if a lawyer files the papers. I am certain that at the last minute a lawyer can help you in court, if you go there. The major cost of an appeal may well not be that of a lawyer but that of the necessary preliminaries, like buying and printing a stenographic transcript, the exhibits, etc. If a lawyer helped you after you file pro se, I think you'd be co-counsel and you are absolutely right about no lawyer knowing "all the factual details". Bud and Jim made repeated and unnecessary error in the spectro with the most elementary facts, even when they were correctly embodied in the typed papers I gave Bud in advance. Then they never consulted with me in advance of filing anything, so I could not correct. Take my advice and have a mechanism where you can exercise some control, for it Bud and Jim do this, what can you expect of a lawyer ~~with~~ knowing nothing at all about the assassination? Your question, can I afford a lawyer, is something like can I be happy? For the long pull, unless you are loaded, you cannot. You have to figure on an appeal, even if you win, and then a further appeal to the Supreme Court, for these bastards are not supposed to give themselves the chance to fall over dead with the first wind from Winnetka.

If you forget, you did send me what I did tell them about on the spectro, but don't send, for at some point we must stop the idle use in minor publication, usually inaccurate and worse, extreme in interpretation, of what could otherwise be used responsibly and perhaps with an element of surprise. They know I have, know I will produce in time for preparation of verbal arguments. I have a file on what I'm keeping from them until the last minute, new stuff on the spectro, of which this is but one of several important items. And I think it is major. Last part: Frazier's testimony also amounts to this. It is in the first thing I gave Bud, which addresses the question of should you be your own lawyer. You'd better be. There is a certain amount of work that cannot be eliminated, and my experience with most lawyers is that they try to eliminate too much. Give them everything and they won't read it. (I have filed this carbon under spectro and I may well forget.)

Pre-ass files on LHO on HUAC (I'm filing under Os as Agt): I think you should first remind Archives and cite ltr from Willis. Note the use of "public" files. Why did they have to restrict something like this Commission? Should it not have had their everything? This whole business suggests to me that they had the FBI files, and it is safe to assume the closest liason. To send over the "public" file was to do no more than send duplicating clips. That served no purpose, as the Committee had to know. On what he wanted a subpoena for, could this not be Butler? And the need of a subpoena? I think if of official origin, he'd have suggested available in the normal course from other and official sources. Re CD697, I have neither a card nor recollection of this. What sources could they have had other than some official on the LHO property, with which there was an inaccurate official record (I have even all the pictures in the files, and the dates are wrong, and see under Stovall in W)? The source had to be DPD of FBI (our old friend deb).

My Stern file seems to be misfiled, so I do not know if you sent me what was sent by

JLR to the ~~xxx~~ saintly one. If you did, it will, eventually, turn up. If you recall, please let me know, for if you did not and I did not get it on my own, I may at some point waste much time trying to find it.

I've had no word from Brown.

For your legal file, you should have a copy of the draft report of the Administrative Conference on the U.S., not released and not approved, for its research already done for you and its citations. Jim can provide or tell you how to get. I think you should send him a list of the decision citations you have and ask for those he has, so you'll have all precedent.

Second p Stern's draft indicates reason to believe that SOG and Filed files not identical, an important point considering what happened with the bigshot witnesses. Naturally it and the request for what had been withheld from the Commission were deleted!

P7, proposed q 27: was there any inquiry about other "visits"? Marina had already told the SS (11/24) or more.

Did you ever get any more on Q 29, the contact with the known subversives? Hosty could not have considered Walker subversive. Could this have been a ACLU meeting?

I'll try and get onto the Molina mailing soon.

Best,